



MATTHEW L. SCHWARTZ
Tel.: (212) 303-3646
E-mail: mlschwartz@bsflp.com

March 5, 2018

BY ECF

Honorable Katharine H. Parker
United States Magistrate Judge
Southern District of New York
500 Pearl Street, Suite 1950
New York, New York 10007

**Re: *City of Almaty, Kazakhstan, et ano. v. Mukhtar Ablyazov, et al.*,
Case No. 15 Civ. 5345 (AJN) (KHP)**

Dear Judge Parker:

We represent the City of Almaty, Kazakhstan and BTA Bank (“the Kazakh Entities”), and write pursuant to the Court’s Order of February 2, 2018 [ECF No. 543], in connection with Triadou SPV S.A.’s motion to compel dated December 7, 2017. [ECF No. 492].

In accordance with the Court’s Order of January 10, 2018, the Kazakh Entities invoked their rights as crime victims under Kazakh law to request certain documents from the Republic of Kazakhstan’s Anti-Corruption Bureau (formerly known as the Financial Police). On February 2, 2018, the parties provided to the Court a copy of the Anti-Corruption Bureau’s initial response to that request, which stated that “pre-trial investigation data can be made public only with the permission of the prosecutor,” and that a “final response to [the Kazakh Entities’ request] will be submitted after the approval of this issue with the prosecutor’s office.” [ECF No. 542].

The parties also committed to update the Court on any further developments within 30 days, and at this time, the Kazakh Entities have not received any update from the Anti-Corruption Bureau regarding their request. The Kazakh Entities propose to update the Court on this issue when any update from the Anti-Corruption Bureau is received.¹

Respectfully,

/s/ Matthew L. Schwartz
Matthew L. Schwartz

¹ Triadou proposed that the parties provide the Court with a status update on this issue in 30 days, which is what the parties proposed in their first status report and what the Court ordered in its Memo Endorsement in response to that status report. [ECF No. 543]. The Kazakh Entities, however, believe that Triadou’s proposed schedule is unnecessary; the Anti-Corruption Bureau stated in its initial response that this matter had been referred to the General Prosecutor’s Office and that the Anti-Corruption Bureau was still awaiting a decision (*id.*, at 3), so monthly updates from the parties before they receive any further response from the Anti-Corruption Bureau would simply expand the docket to no benefit.